

the work of the school solely or primarily as a psycho-analyst.¹

My psycho-analytic experience did naturally lead me to be interested in *all* the behaviour of the children, and meant that I was not prepared to select from it, for recording and for active understanding, only such behaviour as pleased me or as fitted into the general convention as to what little children feel and talk about, or what they should feel and talk about. I was just as ready to *record* and to *study* the less attractive aspects of their behaviour as the more pleasing, whatever my aims and preferences as their *educator* might be.

On the educational side, I took up the work with the deliberate hope that a greater degree of freedom in the children's relations with each other than is usually allowed, and especially a greater freedom of verbal expression of their feelings and interests, would prove a benefit to them both in their intellectual and in their social development. But, as I have tried to make clear in Chapter II of *Intellectual Growth in Young Children*, the educational method of the school was by no means simply a crude "freedom". It followed a definite technique with clear positive aims, a technique which I yet kept open to modification in the light of any further understanding which the actual behaviour of the children might yield. My attitude was rather more tentative with regard to the sexual curiosity and excremental interests of the children than elsewhere, since I felt that a good deal more watching and learning was needed there, before anyone could be certain that the *best* educational technique had been reached. Above all, the first necessity was to ascertain the actual facts. (To this problem I return in full detail in Part II.)

When, however, particularly troublesome sorts of behaviour arose, such as spitting (among a few of the children), I saw no

¹ In this connection, I need to point out that the reference made by Bertrand Russell in *The Scientific Outlook* (p. 186) to my school and to my book *Intellectual Growth in Young Children* is somewhat misleading. On the intellectual side, the school could hardly be described as an "application of psycho-analytic theory to education". It was far more truly an application to the education of very young children of the educational philosophy of John Dewey. This was my active inspiration. The only point at which psycho-analytic theory is touched in *Intellectual Growth in Young Children* has reference to its confirmation of the view, long held by psychologists and -educationists in general, of the great educational value of *play*.